

REMARKS

Claims 1, 10, 13, 18, and 23 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1 – 29 are pending in this Application. Reconsideration and further examination is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim(s) 1-4, 7-11, 13-14, 16-19, 21-26, and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The above recited claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Project 2000 as evidenced by Pyron et al., Using Microsoft Project 2000 (2000; MS Project) in view of Clark, U.S, Patent No. 7,062, 449. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as MS Project and Clark, taken together or in part, fail to teach or suggest the Applicants' invention as claimed.

The Applicants' invention as now set forth in exemplary claim 1 includes a method for tracking the status of a workflow. The method includes the steps of generating a weblog to track an instance of the workflow, the weblog being an application separate from the workflow, the workflow having a plurality of workflow steps, each step performed by at least one member, each of the members having at least one workflow role; assigning the at least one member to the weblog; and automatically posting an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred.

An example implementation of the Applicants' invention is set forth at Applicants' Specification at [00028] helps understand the claimed invention. In this example, the workflow involves processes associated with the delivery of cars at a car dealership. "The workflow

includes various steps or actions to be performed such as financing approval, inventory tracking, receiving the car, selling the car, servicing the car, and a means to handle exceptions or actions not described within the workflow.” The weblog, an application that tracks the workflow, is automatically updated as workflow steps are completed. See for example Applicants’ specification at [00016] “As workflow actions occur, the weblog system automatically posts entries in the weblog. In effect, the workflow weblog acts as a logging mechanism for the workflow where messages and updates are automatically generated and posted.”

As admitted in the Office Action, MS Project fails to teach or suggest the Applicants’ claimed step of “automatically posting an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred”. The Office Action, however, refers to Clark as teaching “a system and method for tracking the status of a workflow comprising automatically determining, updating, and posting … when workflow action status change – specifically automatically logging when a workflow action is completed...” and “it would have been obvious … that the system and method for tracking status of a workflow as taught by MS Project would have benefited from automatically posting an entry in the project to indicate that a workflow action has occurred in view of the teaching of Clark; the resultant system and method enabling users to automatically obtain real-time project status”. The Applicants disagree.

Clark, at Column 13. Lines 30 – 36, describes an automatic project updating system that updates project data within a project system. A task data processing system collects data from various input devices into a lookup table that identifies the data with various projects and tasks running on the system and distributes it accordingly amongst the projects and tasks. But all of this is occurring within a single application, within the “workflow” itself. In other words, Clark

fails to teach or suggest a weblog (or any application) separate from the workflow that tracks the workflow. Therefore, Clark cannot be technically combined with MS Project to arrive at the Applicant's claimed element of "automatically posting an entry in the weblog to indicate that a workflow action has occurred". No combination of MS Project or Clark suggests that one application should automatically post an entry to indicate that an action has occurred in a separate application as is claimed. This is the problem with MS Project in the first place, and neither MS Project nor Clark suggest the problem or its solution.

The Applicants therefore respectfully assert that Claim 1 and its dependent Claims 2 – 4 and 7 – 9 are in condition for allowance. Independent Claims 10, 13, 18, and 23 contain limitations similar to that of Claim 1; therefore, the Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 10 – 11, 13 – 14, 16- 19, 21 – 26, and 28 – 29 are also in condition for allowance.

Rejection of Claim(s) 5-6, 12, 15, 20, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The above recited claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MS Project in view of Clark and further in view of Official Notice. The Applicants assert that the dependent claims 5-6, 12, 15, 20, and 27 are allowable by virtue of the fact that their respective independent claims 1, 10, 13, 18, and 23 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks made herein, Applicant(s) submit(s) that the application is in condition for allowance and request early favorable action by the Examiner.

